

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-8119**

---

JOHN ANTHONY MATTHEWS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ROBERT KOPPEL, Warden, Jessup Correctional Institution;  
DOUGLAS F. GANSLER, Attorney General of the State of  
Maryland,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.  
(1:08-cv-01389-CCB)

---

Submitted: May 20, 2010

Decided: May 25, 2010

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gary Eugene Bair, BENNETT & BAIR, LLC, Greenbelt, Maryland, for  
Appellant. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Anthony Matthews seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Matthews has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Matthews's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED